REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Of these pending claims, claims 3-5, 7-13 and 15-17 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to non-elected species.

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,066.933 to Komeda. Claims 2 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komeda in view of Dixon, Jr. et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claims 1 and 6 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a high-frequency filter wherein an odd-mode resonant frequency is determined by lengths of the microstrip line resonators and an even-mode resonant frequency is determined by lengths of the microstrip line resonators and the inductance of the through-hole such that a bandwidth of the filter is adjusted by a value of the inductance of the through-hole. Support for this Amendment can be found on page 5, lines 11-15 of the present specification.

Therefore, in accordance with the claimed invention, by changing the value of the inductance according to a desired bandwidth, the amount of coupling between the microstrip line resonators can be easily adjusted.

Komeda neither teaches nor suggests such a filter. Komeda is directed to a bandwidth filter which includes a plurality of half wavelength microstrip resonators which are connected to a grounded conductor via a through-hole provided at the center of each of the resonators. With this structure, Komeda et al. states that the band-pass filter is rendered in a resonance condition only at the central frequency of the passband and is not rendered in a resonance condition at the integral multiple frequencies of the central frequency. See column 1, lines 53-57, and column 2, lines 53-58. In other words, in the filter of Komeda a spurious

resonance mode of the resonators is suppressed. There is nothing within Komeda which teaches, or even remotely suggests, that the bandwidth of the filter is adjusted by adjusting a value of the inductance of the through-hole as required by independent claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, since each and every limitation as defined in independent claims 1 and 6 is neither disclosed nor suggested in Komeda, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over Komeda.

Dixon, Jr. et al. does not remedy any of the deficiencies of Komeda. In particular, there is nothing within Dixon, Jr. et al. which teaches or even remotely suggests that the bandwidth of the filter is adjusted by adjusting a value of the inductance of the through-hole as required by independent claims 1 and 6.

Therefore, even if one were to combine the teachings of Komeda and Dixon, Jr. et al., one would not arrive at the present invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Claim 2 depends directly from independent claim 1 and includes all of the limitations found therein. Claim 14 depends directly from independent claim 6 and includes all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 2 and 14 are likewise patentable.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is generic to the embodiments of claims 3, 4 and 5, and that independent claim 6 is generic to the embodiments of claims 7-13 and 15-17. Thus, it is respectfully requested that dependent claims 3-5, 7-13 and 15-17 be considered and allowed along with independent claims 1 and 6.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1 and 6, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-17 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: July 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava
Registration No.: 41,135
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant